1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
11	Junagarh	139.46	1104	987	207.63	1300	1300
12	Kachchh	104.30	1288	1259	124.70	943	943
13	Kheda	200.35	1680	1095	276.00	1689	1126
14	Mehsana	99.78	801	801	133.42	771	771
15	Nairmada	149.42	1356	1356	224.85	1502	NR
16	Navsari	126.67	1035	1035	195.92	1108	1108
17	Panchmahal	273.03	2380	1607	433.34	2610	1194
18	Patan	80.38	683	683	127.82	609	609
19	Porbandar	29.76	292	227	55.56	189	189
20	Raikot	155.17	1251	1251	212.06	1344	1344
21	Sabarkantha	274.99	2008	2008	458.01	1880	1880
22	Surat	329.98	2802	2802	452.84	3704	3704
23	Surendemagar	147.50	1154	859	195.70	1145	1145
24	Vadodara	. 243.56	1949	1949	331.61	2118	2118
25	Valsad	166.96	1340	1340	238.38	1606	1579
	TOTAL:	3744.63	31189	27163	5416.01	33654	27297

NR-Not Reporting

Implementation status of various employment generation programmes

† 2492. SHRI NAND KISHORE YADAV: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether any assessment has been made regarding status of implementation of various programmes related to employment generation in projected rural areas under Tenth Five Year Plan in Uttar Pradesh;

(b) if so, the plan-wise and district-wise details of the status including the number of the families brought above poverty line? and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI A. NARENDRA): (a) The Ministry of Rural Development has assessed the impact of the implementation of employment generation schemes namely the Swarnjayanti Gram Swarojgar Yojana (SGSY) and Sampoorna Gramin Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) through Concurrent Evaluation Study, conducted by the independent Research Organisations, in all the States and Union Territories of the Country, except UTs of Chandigarh and Delhi during Tenth Plan Period.

† Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

(b) and (c) The families crossed the poverty line are assessed under the self employment programme of SGSY only. According to the Concurrent Evaluation Study of SGSY, District-wise percentage of Swarojgaris (Individual and Group) crossed the poverty line due to SGSY are given in the Statement.

Statement

Swarozgaris above poverty line due to SGSY

SI. No.	District	%Swarozgaris with Income above poverty line	
		Individual	Group
1.	Agra	4.56	0.94
2.	Aligarh	4.92	5.75
3.	Allahabad	4.29	4.58
4.	Ambedkar Nagar	4.02	10.57
5.	Amroha	4.14	10.51
6.	Auraiya	5.15	7.55
7.	Azamgarh	3.55	9.23
8.	Badaun	5.21	9.18
9.	Bagpat	3.31	10.18
10	Bahriach	3.31	4.87
11.	Balia	4.21	2.37
12	Balrampur	4.29	11.35
13.	Banda	3.33	3.05
14.	Barabanki	4.67	10.84
15.	Bareily	4.68	10.78
16.	Basti	4.33	9.94
17.	Bhadohi	3.47	8.67
18.	Bijnaur	5.00	3.98
19.	Bulandshahar	3.90	7.68
20.	Chandauli	3.50	8.74
21.	C.S.M. Nagar	4.74	10.96
22.	Deoria	4.90	10.84
23.	Etah	3.41	11.39
24.	Etawah	4.29	2.99
25.	Faizabad	4.49	11.50

† Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

SI. No.	District	%Swarozgaris with Income above poverty line	
		Individual	Group
26.	Fetehpur	4.75	8.80
27.	Firozabad	5.28	2.60
28.	Furrukhabad	4.58	12.84
29.	Gautam Budh Nagar	3.46	9.76
30.	Ghaziabad	4.11	10.47
31.	Ghazipur	3.56	7.19
32.	Gonda	3.57	3.96
33.	Gorakhpur	3.91	8.64
34.	Hamirpur	3.37	10.76
35.	Hardoi	3.43	10.19
36.	Jalaun	3.92	8.64
37.	Jaunpur	3.76	9.40
38.	Jhansi	3.45	7.10
39.	Kannauj	3.51	13.26
40.	Kanpur Dehat	3.92	3.85
41.	Kanpur Nagar	3.37	8.64
42.	Kaushambi	4.95	6.93
43.	Kheri (Lakhimpur)	4.00	9.22
44.	Lalitpur	3.42	8.64
45.	Lucknow	3.39	9.24
46.	Mahamaya Nagar (hathras)	4.02	0.89
47.	Maharajganj	4.45	8.91
48.	Mahoba	4.08	5.08
49.	Mainpuri	3.76	4.78
50.	Mathura	3.48	3.59
51.	Maunath Bhanjan	4.09	7.87
52.	Meerut	4.14	8.83
53.	Mirzapur	3.74	8.85
54.	Moradabad	3.60	9.13
55.	Mazaffarnagar	3.70	9.31
56.	Padrauna	3.62	9.34
57.	Pilibhit	3.47	3.96
58.	Pratapgarh	3.87	3.63
59.	Rai Bareilly	5.69	1.21

Sl. No.	District	%Swarozgaris with Income above poverty line	
		Individual	Group
60.	Rampur	3.84	8.64
61.	Saharanpur	6.28	1.84
62.	Sant Kabir Nagar	3.88	9.58
63.	Shahjahanpur	3.71	9.41
64.	Sharavasti	3.87	9.12
65.	Sidharthnagar	3.52	7.95
66.	Sitapur	3.59	9.08
67.	Sonhadra	3.62	9.03
68.	Sultanpur	3.75	8.79
69.	Unnao	3.76	5.52
70.	Varanasi	3.53	4.71
	TOTAL:	4.03	7.68

Irregularities in FFWP in MP

† 2493. SHRI P.K. MAHESHWARI: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware of the fact that irregularities are being committed on a large scale in 'Food for Work' scheme being run by Government in Madhya Pradesh;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) the details of unemployed persons having been provided with employment in Madhya Pradesh under 'Food for Work' scheme as on date?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI A. NARENDRA): (a) and (b) There are no reports of large scale irregularities in the implementation of National Food for Work Programme in Madhya Pradesh. Since, the programme has been launched almost seven months ago, there were some initial implementation related problems being faced by the implementing/ executing agencies. Gradually the implementing agencies are picking

† Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.